## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Catrena Lashan Hughes-Parker,	) C/A No. 1:15-cv-04226-JMC-KDW
Plaintiff,	)
vs.	ORDER
G4S Government Solutions Inc.; Centerra Group LLC; Wackenhut Inc.,	) ) )
Defendants.	) ) )

Plaintiff, then proceeding pro se, filed this civil action on October 14, 2015, seeking relief from one defendant, "Centerra Security, S.R.S. Aiken, SC." ECF No. 1. At that time, pretrial proceedings were referred to the assigned United States Magistrate Judge under Local Civil Rule 73.02(B) (D.S.C.). Because Plaintiff sought to proceed *in forma pauperis* and was proceeding pro se, the undersigned performed initial review of Plaintiff's pro se Complaint and the Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Subsequent to that initial review, the court issued its initial Order, granting *in forma* pauperis status and directing the then-pro se Plaintiff to submit a completed Form USM-285 for the only defendant she had named, as it was then contemplated that Plaintiff would require assistance from the United States Marshal to serve her Complaint on that Defendant. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (requiring court to order service by "a United States marshal or deputy marshal or by a person specially appointed by the court" where the plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis* and requests such an order). Plaintiff was to provide the Form USM-285 to put the matter into proper form no later than November 9, 2015. ECF No. 9.

Before the November 9, 2015 deadline passed, and without any response by Plaintiff on her own behalf, counsel entered an appearance on Plaintiff's behalf on October 21, 2015. ECF No. 12. On that same date, Plaintiff's counsel submitted to the Clerk of Court an Amended Complaint and a prepared summons form listing the names and address of the three Defendants named in the Amended Complaint. ECF No. 13. Counsel did not submit any completed Forms USM-285 to the Clerk of Court and did not request the court's order regarding assistance with service of process. As she does as a matter of course in counseled cases, the Clerk of Court formally issued the summons submitted by counsel and returned that issued summons to Plaintiff's counsel. ECF No. 17.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's counsel is directed to effect service of process on Defendants within the time permitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). Because Plaintiff is now

represented by legal counsel, the United States Marshals Service will not be involved in this case for the purpose of service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 26, 2015 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Hayma & Hest